DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 377 173 SP 035 606

AUTHOR Vezzuto, Lucy A.

TITLE Beyond Minimum Competence: The Appraisal of Teaching Practice. A Proposal Submitted to the Teaching Practice Committee, Universiti Brunei Darussalam Faculty of Education, Brunei Darussalam, Southeast Asia.

PUB DATE Dec 92
NOTE 34p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Check Lists; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; Foreign Countries; *Grading; Higher Education; Minimum Competencies; Pass Fail Grading; *Preservice Teacher Education; Program Development; Program Implementation; Student Educational Objectives; *Student Teacher Evaluation; Student Teachers; Student Teaching; *Teacher Competencies
IDENTIFIERS Universiti Brunei Darussalam

ABSTRACT

This proposal focuses on the grading system used for preservice student teachers in the Faculty of Education's certificate and degree programs at Universiti Brunei Darussalam. A rationale for an appraisal system with finer delineations than the existing pass-fail system is presented. This rationale is based on the beliefs that standards of quality and excellence are not rewarded in the pass-fail system, outstanding performance is not recognized nor valued, and potential employers are not provided with a useful evaluation of preservice performance. Different views of teaching which determine the content and criteria of teaching performance evaluation are discussed, focusing on teaching as labor, craft, profession, and art. Major dimensions of teacher performance that should be evaluated are identified; these include quality of content taught, success in imparting and inspiring learning, mastery of professional skills, and ethics. A five-point grading system that reaches beyond minimum competence as a standard for student teaching performance is offered. A final evaluation instrument with profiles of performance based on the objectives of the Teaching Practice Program is included. The format of the final evaluation tool is a checklist and narrative, covering preparation, teaching performance, classroom interaction, professional competencies, and classroom curriculum areas. Implementation issues are considered. (Contains 35 references.) (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 377 173

BEYOND MINIMUM COMPETENCE:

THE APPRAISAL OF TEACHING PRACTICE

A Proposal Submitted to the Teaching Practice Committee

Universiti Brunei Darussalam

Faculty of Education

Brunei Darussalam, Southeast Asia

By Lucy A. Vezzuto, Ph.D.

December 1992

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L.A. Vezzuto

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEYOND MINIMUM COMPETENCE:
THE APPRAISAL OF TEACHING PRACTICE

Contents

Preface

I. Introduction 2

II. Current Assessment System 4

- Pass-Fail Grading System
- Reconsideration

III. Beyond Minimum Competence: A Rationale for Change 6

IV. Framework and Assumptions of Teacher Performance Appraisal 11

- Views of the Nature of Teaching
- Major Dimensions of Teacher Performance

V. Evaluation of Student Teachers: A Letter-grade System 16

- Final Evaluation: Objectives and Criteria for Grading
- Final Evaluation Instrument
- Profiles of Performance

VI. Implementation Challenges 29

- Staff Development
- Evaluation of Supervisors
- Future Recruitment of Faculty
- Qualities of Effective Supervisors
- Other Considerations
- Plan of Action

References 35

PREFACE

At the beginning of the 1992-1993 academic year, Dr. Patrick Duignan, Dean of the Faculty of Education and Dr. Anicia Alvarez, Deputy Dean, requested that I conduct a review of two areas in the teaching practice program at the Universiti Brunei Darussalam: the current assessment system of teaching practice and the organization and scheduling of teaching practice within the certificate and degree programs. After lengthy discussions with Hjh. Aisah bte. Hj. Mohd. Yusof, Head of the Teaching Practice Department, it was decided that the matter of assessment would be the priority. This proposal focuses on that issue.

This proposal is presented to the members of the Teaching Practice Committee for their review and consideration. It is hoped that it can be a starting point for consideration and eventual consensus. First, the proposal will be distributed to the committee members. Subsequently, in January 1993, I will formally present the paper to the committee for review and discussion. I will be available to work with the committee through the process of deliberation and decision.

I would like to thank all of the committee members and staff who shared their history of the issue, their professional expertise and valuable analysis with me. Their contributions were crucial to the development of this proposal. My gratitude is extended to: Dr. Muchkiar Suradinata, Hj. Md. Jamudin, Awg. Abu Bakar, Mr. Goh Keat Seong, Mr. Michael Asghar, Mr. Jacob Chin, Hj. Abdul Halim Yusof, Hjh. Junaidah, Dr. Anicia Alvarez, Hjh. Sofiah A. Serudin, Hj. Tajudin, Mr. Jim Welsh, Mr. Cheah Swee Ming, and Mr. Nelson Chong Choo Tuan.

I especially want to thank Hjh. Aisah, Dr. Patrick Duignan, and Dr. Anicia Alvarez for their continued support.

I. INTRODUCTION

This proposal focuses on the grading system used for preservice student teachers in the Faculty of Education's certificate and degree programs at Universiti Brunei Darussalam (UBD). The aim of this paper is to present a 5-point grading system that reaches "beyond minimum competence" as a standard for student teaching performance. A rationale for an appraisal system with finer delineations than the current pass-fail system is presented. Assumptions about the nature of teaching underlie any appraisal system. A brief discussion will be presented of the different views of teaching which determine the content and criteria of teaching performance evaluation. This paper includes a final evaluation instrument with "profiles of performance" based on the objectives of the Teaching Practice (TP) Program. Also considered are issues regarding the challenge of implementing a letter-grade system.

This proposal does not address the performance evaluation of experienced teachers who are participating in teaching practice as "up-graders." The nature of practice teaching for the degree students with teaching certificates is very different from preservice teachers, although many standards of effective teaching can be applied to both groups. New and preservice teachers tend to focus their concerns on their own performance, while the concerns of experienced teachers tend to be more "mature" and focus on pupil gain and self-evaluation (Fuller, 1969).

Designing the goals of teaching practice specifically for the needs of experienced teachers would be more relevant and effective. That is, teaching practice objectives should consider a certified teacher's experience and need for professional development. These goals are offered as an illustration: defining beliefs regarding the nature of teaching and schooling; developing the ability to reflect and critique one's teaching; defining goals for improvement; and developing criteria (in cooperation with university supervisor) for the assessment of one's objectives. A 5-point grading system is recommended for the evaluation of degree candidates participating in teaching practice. The rationale presented in this paper is equally relevant to both preservice teachers and "up-graders" although this proposal focuses on the former.

II. CURRENT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

Pass-Fail Grading System

Currently, both certificate and degree programs offered by the Faculty of Education at Universiti Brunei Darussalam use a pass-fail system for the evaluation of the performance of teaching practice. The university supervisor assigned to the student teacher is responsible for observing and evaluating the candidate's performance during a six or eight week session, depending on the program. The supervisor is required to visit and observe the candidate teaching at least four times during the teaching practice period. These observations are documented and evaluated using the form "Comments of the Lesson." The cooperating teacher and the supervisor separately complete a "Feedback on Teaching" evaluation at a midpoint in the teaching practice term and discuss the results with the candidate. At the end of the teaching practice session, the university supervisor uses the instrument "Final Teaching Assessment" to record the final evaluation.

In addition, the supervisor has other duties. These include meeting with the cooperating teacher to discuss the candidate's progress, conferencing with the student teacher following observations, consulting with the candidate on aspects of teaching preparations and performance, and reviewing the candidate's file. It is the responsibility of the university supervisor to issue a grade of "pass" or "fail."

All courses in the Faculty of Education are weighted at 25% per year for the classification of degrees. There is no weighting of the "pass" grade for teaching practice. The "pass" grade carries no distinction in the system of classification of degrees.

Reconsideration

In 1990, the pass-fail grading system was initiated for the evaluation of teaching practice. A letter-grade system was used during the first few years after the Institute of Education merged with the university. There is no delineation of the rationale or the use of this system in any formal sense. But according to the

minutes of Teaching Practice Committee meetings, a debate has continued for several years regarding the merits of the current grading system. Documents written by the former head of the Teaching Practice Department, Mr. Cheah Swee Ming, summarize the views of the faculty expressed in meetings and resulting from a faculty survey (November 1991).

During the first semester of 1991, the TP Committee conducted a survey of the Faculty of Education's preference of grading system for teaching practice. The response rate for the survey was 27%, with 15 out of 55 questionnaires returned. Of the 15 respondents eight favored adopting a letter-grade system and seven favored retaining the current pass-fail system. The wording on the survey stated that if it was not returned it was assumed that the unknown respondent favored the current system. One cannot be sure that the respondents' intention was to signal support of the current system or the survey was lost, forgotten, deliberately ignored or other possibilities. There is no certainty in a nonresponse. Therefore, it is questionable to conclude that most of the faculty favors the current grading system.

The former Head of the Teaching Practice Department summarized arguments on both sides of the debate (November 1991). The Head of the Department of Language Education wrote a report documenting a meeting that was held where a consensus was reached favoring a letter-grade system (May 1992). An external examiner also has discussed the teaching practice grading system and recommended that the faculty adopt a 5-point rating system (June 1991). In the next section of this paper, a rationale is presented for the adoption of a 5-point letter-grade system for the evaluation of teaching practice. The concerns and arguments included in the previously mentioned documents are considered.

III. BEYOND MINIMUM COMPETENCE: A RATIONALE FOR CHANGE

Society entrusts young people to their teacher at the most critical time of childhood and adolescence. What knowledge and skills will be passed on? What life lessons will be modeled for these students? Will the students blossom in a learning environment that is stimulating, involving and challenging? It depends on the knowledge and skill of the teacher.

It is no secret. The research on teacher effectiveness consistently supports the belief that the teacher is the critical factor associated with high pupil achievement (Rupley & Blair, 1980; Harris, 1979; Stallings 1978; Rosenshine, 1979; Brophy, 1979). The decisions a teacher makes and the ways these decisions are carried out everyday will make a difference in the life of a young person and ultimately the whole society.

The responsibility of educating, training, and evaluating teachers is no less important. Lessons learned at the university through course work and teaching practice form the foundation of the teacher's education and professional development. The value and worth placed on practice teaching, in addition to the experience, has a lasting impression on the student teacher.

Value and worth are signaled by the emphasis placed on an experience. Tests and grades are a reality of this schooling system. Degrees are classified according to the grades of a student. For many students, grades, and ultimately a degree with honors, provide motivation and an incentive to perform. (In a perfect world the love of learning alone would suffice.)

Currently, in the classification of degrees, the "pass" grade of teaching practice has no distinction, and is considered the lowest classification of a degree. What message of value and worth does this send to the preservice teacher? The act of teaching does not merit "distinction." The minimum standard is acceptable and outstanding performance in the current grading system is not recognized nor valued. Standards of quality and excellence are not rewarded in the pass-fail system. Currently it carries less "weight" than a course with equal or lesser units.

House and Lapan in their article "Teacher Appraisal" state that "evaluating teachers for minimum

competence ... is at best a partial approach and one that may be counterproductive in that it discourages good teaching." The nature of humans is such that motivation is a critical ingredient for success in any endeavor. In more than 11 interviews conducted with members of the Teaching Practice Committee and other faculty, motivation of students was consistently cited as the reason to consider a change in the current grading system. In his June 1991 report, UBD's External Examiner, Professor Isahak Bin Haron, writes that a letter-graded system "will also provide greater motivation for students to prepare their lessons and improve their performance in classroom teaching." In a report by the Head of the Department of Language Education the issue of motivation and reward was discussed:

> We believe that students who put in the time and effort should be rewarded and given credit similar to their performance/achievements in examinations. After all, TP (teaching practice) is a practical examination of their professional ability. With no overt reward for good performance during TP, students are not motivated to even try to be good teachers. TP should not be perceived as an event whereby one has just to go through the motion(s) with the least input of effort. (May 1992)

It is likely that a student teacher will improve his performance not only for the recognition that a grade bestows but also for the sense of responsibility and satisfaction that he has tried his best. A letter grade can serve as a catalyst to generate commitment. It would also provide more accurate feedback of student work and more precise evaluation of performance. As one official from the Ministry of Education stated, "Excellence should be recognized."

The Teaching Practice Committee has an opportunity to support the belief in the worth and value of teaching. A letter-grade system "consider(s) teaching at its highest levels of quality, not as a minimum standard pass-fail situation. ...A high-quality teacher appraisal scheme would provide for excellent teaching as well as for eliminating incompetence" (House and Lapan, 1989).

The faculty of a university, the place of higher learning in a society, is regarded for its expertise in educating and evaluating competency. The community looks to the university to make judgments and distinctions among the different levels of students' abilities. Indeed the grading system and the classification of degrees are used to do this. We "label" students each time a grade is given and when degree distinctions are given. Making differentiations among varying degrees of competency goes with the territory of academic responsibilities.

Reliability of grading procedures is an important concern in any course and program. It is thought to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

be "impossible" to have any two supervisors agree on the evaluation of a student teacher's performance. It is possible when processes are in place that support the integrity of the grading system: such as clearly defined program objectives stated in behavioral terms, agreement on criteria for what constitutes competency, staff development for supervisors, the option to consult with colleagues on borderline cases, and the evaluation of supervisors performance. (This final issue is discussed further in the section, "Implementation Challenges.")

Another issue that has been raised by faculty members is determining a grade for student teachers who are placed in very different school and classroom situations. Several examples come to mind: in one classroom the cooperating teacher may be very supportive while in another classroom the cooperating teacher may be aloof; the behavior of students in one class may be undisciplined while in another class student behavior is exemplary. Teaching is a situational experience. Experienced teachers know that, for instance, the characteristics of students in a class can differ from year to year. In the evaluation of teaching performance the unique situation of the placement of the student teacher is a consideration. However, a supervisor is evaluating the actual performance within the context of the circumstances. How a student teacher handles a difficult situation can be evaluated. The following questions could provide the data for evaluation: What decision was made? What actions carried out the decision? Was it successful? Did the student continue to seek solutions for problems not readily solved? Even under the best of circumstances, poor teaching decisions can result, for example, in a model class becoming chaotic. The focus of evaluation should be on how a student teacher handles his unique situation. The focus of evaluation should be on how a student teacher handles his unique situation.

Comparing a candidates' performance at times may be useful, but emphasis needs to be placed on self-competition and self-improvement. The performance at the beginning of the assignment can serve as a baseline by which to measure the progress (or lack of progress) made during the period. However, the final grade should reflect the optimal performance achieved during the teaching practice. A grade symbolizing the "average" of the performance does not accurately represent what the student teacher has achieved.

Finally, from the viewpoint of the community that the university serves, a more precise system of grading provides potential public and private employers with a useful evaluation of preservice performance. In addition, narrative comments included with the final evaluation identifying the areas of subject-area strength of a certified teacher would contribute to the proper placement of the new teacher. A finer delineated system of evaluation would also indicate to the employer the areas in need of administrative support and staff development. A letter grade could also serve as one

indicator for selection of the most promising teachers for further advanced study and leadership positions. However, it should be indicated that this evaluation reflects a starting point upon which to build with continued training and professional support.

It would not be inconsistent with the university's current system of grading and degree distinctions to accept the challenge and responsibility of extending the judgments of academic experts to the performance of teaching practice. The adoption of a more precise measure of the student teacher's performance would lend more credibility to the experience. It also would reassert the university's support and commitment to the importance of preparing qualified, professional teachers for the society. UBD would not be setting precedent in this area. Most ASEAN universities use a letter-grade system for the evaluation of teaching practice (Liew, 1992).

IV. FRAMEWORK AND ASSUMPTIONS FOR TEACHER PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Views of the Nature of Teaching

Assumptions posited by the differing views of the nature of teaching underlie any teacher appraisal system. The type of teacher appraisal is associated with the way one conceives the job of teaching. The view of teaching influences the objectives and criteria used for making judgments of outstanding, good, fair, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory performance. Definitions of the nature of teaching may differ among educators and thus cause difficulty in coming to a consensus on an evaluation system for teaching performance. While dissimilar views may be difficult to reconcile, understanding the premises that underpin a colleague's view of teaching may lay a foundation for discussion and a pathway to understanding and, ideally, a consensus. The goals and objectives for the Teaching Practice Program are established. Decisions made regarding the evaluation system must be linked to the measurement of the achievement of those agreed-upon performance objectives.

Briefly, four views of the nature of teaching are presented here with their implications for the appraisal of teaching performance. Some may see these distinctions as a hierarchy through which all teachers progress. But each is a different way of viewing the work of teaching and each view generates different standards for an appraisal. It is hoped that the TP Committee will use these designations to reach a better understanding of what underlies the evaluation process for teaching performance. These views can serve as a point of discussion for justification of criteria selected for measurement of performance.

The four fundamental views of teaching are as labor, craft, profession, and art (Wise et al. 1984):

Teaching As Labor

The teacher's job is to implement preset, prescribed procedures and routines.
Appraisal: Includes the direct inspection of the teacher's work such as monitoring lesson plans, classroom performance and performance results.
Criterion: Adherence to set procedure.

Teaching As Craft

Teaching requires a repertoire of specialized techniques and knowledge, including knowledge of how to apply these skills. This view assumes there are specific techniques and general rules for applying them.
Appraisal: Includes indirect inspection and periodic monitoring; evaluation determines indirectly if the teacher has the requisite skills.
Criterion: Adherence to general performance standards.

Teaching As Profession

Teaching requires repertoire of skills and exercise of judgement about where skills should be applied. Teaching requires theoretical and technical knowledge.
Appraisal: Includes a standard of performance developed and determined by peers; support is given by administration for the profession to do their job.
Criterion: Different patterns of performance lead to success.

Teaching As Art

Teaching requires personalizing the techniques and procedures to fit the unpredictable situation even if it means departing from set rules and techniques.
Appraisal: Includes the self-assessment and peer assessment relying on holistic judgments rather than analytical qualities; more on overall pattern of events than discrete behaviors.
Criterion: Unique pattern of performance which gains success.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

So what does this mean for teaching practice? The notion of the minimum standard of pass-fail system is associated with the labor and craft view of teaching where minimum standards are set for success. In this view, Ernest House and Stephen Lapan (1989) state:

> Our ...assumption is that teacher appraisal approaches should consider teaching at its highest levels of quality, not as a minimum standard pass-fail situation. Conventional teacher appraisal is oriented toward a labor-craft view of teaching characterized by minimal standards for success. Little distinction is made between acceptable and outstanding performance. Evaluation should reflect the more comprehensive view of teaching as a profession and as art, thus providing for finer delineations between levels of success. In this perspective the idea of prespecified skills is replaced by the assumption that different and even unique patterns of performance can lead to successful practice.

The view of teaching as a profession-art does not diminish the importance of learning teaching skills, for a professional needs both knowledge and skills. The difference between the views of teaching as labor-craft and profession-art lies in the belief that teaching is a decision-making process; competence lies in the ability to make effective decisions about when and how to use one's knowledge and skills. Teaching is a situational endeavor. Education theories may not always have the answers for dealing with a specific circumstance with a particular student
(Pearson, 1989). The ability of teachers to make rationale decisions and act upon them wisely is a key indicator of a professional. However, it is not suggested that student teachers develop their own standards of performance as stated in this view. They do not yet have the ability to do so. This view underscores the importance of decision-making in the act of teaching.

Finally, culture certainly is a factor in influencing one's view of the nature of teaching. Culture-bound beliefs about concepts such as achievement, authority, group responsibility, and participation add another dimension to the discussion. Even the nature and purpose of evaluation are influenced by culture!

However, cultural diversity among the faculty should not be a roadblock to discussion and agreements on the evaluation of student teaching performance. The goals and objectives of the teaching practice experience have been established; these should serve as a guide in the decision-making process and in generating criteria for a letter-grade system.

It is hoped that presenting these differing views of teaching would enable the members of the Teaching Practice Committee to clarify their view(s) of the nature of teaching. This effort would uncover some of the hidden assumptions that underlie the differing viewpoints regarding student teacher appraisal. This will lay a foundation of understanding that ultimately would assist the members in delineating criteria and standards for evaluation.

Major Dimensions of Teacher Performance

The first assumption of teacher appraisal has been discussed -- consider teaching at its highest level of quality and not as a minimum standard pass-fail situation. The second assumption of the grading system presented here is that evaluations should emphasize major dimensions of teacher performance that can be logically equated with teaching success. These dimensions provide a framework for guiding the appraisal of teaching and thus holding the evaluator to more comprehensive and logical views of the teachers' performance. Scriven (1986) states that "too much of current practice reflects a trivialized perspective allowing evaluators to praise or condemn on the basis of characteristics NOT fundamental to successful practice." He presents the following four dimensions of merit that may serve as a guide in developing criteria for summative student-teacher evaluation:

1. quality of content taught
2. success in imparting and inspiring learning
3. mastery of professional skills, and
4. ethics.

These dimensions are "separately necessary and jointly complete" (Scriven, 1986) inferring that a teacher should be competent in all dimensions to be minimally competent. Good teaching is directly related to the quality of content taught. This is related to the content known, but is not the same thing. Obviously, teachers must have content knowledge but it is also crucial how and whether they apply that knowledge. Success in inspiring and imparting learning pertains not only to the cognitive domain, but also to personal development in the larger sense. Professional skills such as how to control a class, grade assignments, and construct a test properly are important and are directly related to good teaching. Poor indicators of teaching or artifacts of teacher performance such as room arrangement, dress, and promptness "seldom reflect how teachers become good practitioners" (Scriven, 1986). Ethics involves avoidance of racism, favoritism, issues of confidentiality and the like.

V. EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHERS: A LETTER-GRADE SYSTEM

It is recommended that the TP Committee adopt a 5-point letter-grade system for the evaluation of preservice teaching performance. This would allow for a finer delineation of student teaching performance. The elements of the evaluation system are presented below. An evaluation form and profiles of teaching performance are included to aid the supervisor in judging the degree of knowledge and skills for assigning a letter grade.

1. A 5-point grading system (A, B, C, D, F) is recommended for the evaluation of teaching practice. Student teachers would be evaluated using the grading guidelines with the accompanying degree distinctions. However it is suggested that the grade of "C" be the minimum grade for passing teaching practice. A grade of "D" would show that the candidate has "rarely" met the criteria and a grade of "F" would signify that the candidate has "never" met the criteria designated for competence. It is also recommended that the "E" grade be eliminated from the scale. Because of the arbitrary and unreliable method of assigning percentages to elements of teaching performance, it is suggested that only letter grades be used. (The external examiner, Professor Isahak Bin Haron, also has made this suggestion.)

This system would maintain a higher standard for teaching practice because it is vital to provide quality teachers for Brunei's schools. In many professional programs, standards are more rigid; the demands of the job require an acceptable standard of performance. A teacher who performs at or below a "D" level has not shown the competence to accept the responsibility of teaching. What parent would want their child being taught by a teacher who received a "D" in teaching practice? Is it fair to the failing student to send him into the classroom unprepared to face the daily challenges of teaching? Because these students will be affecting the lives of many young children, it is reasonable to expect a higher standard for their performance. The teacher is the critical factor in learning. Through higher standards the Faculty of Education can support this research finding and strengthen the credibility of the Teaching Practice Program.

2. With a grade of "D" or below in either Teaching Practice II or Teaching Practice III, the candidate would repeat the session. Both sessions would require a passing grade for certification. For the preservice degree students, the one teaching practice would require a passing grade. If this grade is not passing, the student would repeat teaching practice. (The TP Committee may want to consider its rationale for requiring only one teaching practice session for preservice degree students especially if these students have no teaching experience. In this respect, the preservice degree students are at par with the certificate students.)

3. In the case of preservice certificate students, only the two final sessions of teaching practices provide the candidate with the opportunity to teach. The goal of Teaching Practice I is to observe the teacher, classroom, and school. The objectives of the session are not focused on teaching performance. This difference could be reflected in a change of the course title (eg. Observation in the Classroom) to reflect the actual objectives of the course. An evaluation of this experience could be based on a report generated by the candidate of their experiences with guidelines given by the lecturer. This can be graded as any other course assignment.

4. The same format for supervision can be continued using the current evaluation criteria and evaluation instruments except for the final evaluation. The supervisor would conduct a minimum of 4 classroom observations and conference with the candidate using the instrument "Comments on the Lesson." (The TP committee may want to consider weekly visits by the supervisor to collect more extensive data upon which to determine a letter grade.) At mid-session, the form "Feedback on Teaching" would be used by the supervisor and cooperating teacher. This evaluation focuses on improving weaknesses and reinforcing strengths of performance. An action plan for the last half of the teaching practice period can be formulated based on the results.

5. The final evaluation form would be completed by the university supervisor with the consultation of the cooperating teacher. It is, however, the responsibility of the supervisor to give the final grade. The cooperating teacher, and principal, if appropriate, can complete the final evaluation form. The supervisor can refer to both evaluations for additional views of the candidate's performance. Usually, the cooperating teacher does observe the candidate more than the supervisor.

6. In the event that the university supervisor would desire a second opinion regarding the final grade for borderline cases, an impartial observer or moderator (such as the head of department or other respected staff member) could be designated to observe the student and consult with the supervisor.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The judgement of this moderator would be recorded and included in the candidate's file. The university supervisor should request the assistance of the moderator within 2 weeks of the end of the teaching practice session. *(This system is practiced by the Nanyang Technology University's Institute of Education.)*

7. The student teacher would be given a blank copy of the final evaluation instrument at the beginning of the teaching practice session. This would allow the candidate to study the objectives and know the criteria for evaluation. The candidate could focus his efforts and set personal goals for attainment. It would also serve as a motivational tool.

8. The final evaluation form would be used for primary and secondary student teachers. The objectives serve both levels and the narrative section of the instrument allows the supervisor to customize comments for each level.

Final Evaluation: Objectives and Criteria for Grading

The objectives and criteria for the final evaluation are generated from the goals of the Teaching Practice Program as stated in the handbook, Teaching Practice: Guidelines for Student-Teachers. The grading scale is based on the student teacher appraisal scale used for the instrument "Feedback on Teaching." The objectives of the Teaching Practice Program follow:

The student teacher will:

1. experience and understand the roles, duties and responsibilities of a teacher.
2. apply learning theories in an actual teaching and learning situation.
3. develop skills and techniques in planning and presenting lessons as well as guiding the learning activities of pupils.
4. develop self-confidence, and qualities of adaptability and sensitivity appropriate to school situations.
5. establish appropriate teacher-pupil relations.
6. develop an understanding of the general administrative structure of the school system.

Proposed 5-Point Grading System for Teaching Practice

A = outstanding or "always" meets objective
B = good or "frequently" meets objective
C = satisfactory or "occasionally" meets objective
D = unsatisfactory or "rarely" meets objective
F = failure or "never" meets objective

A = Outstanding or "Always" Meets Objectives

The "A" or "outstanding" teaching performance consistently meets the objectives outlined in the Teaching Practice Program (which are itemized in the evaluation form). This candidate would rate in the "always" category for the majority of the objectives for evaluation.

B = Good or "Frequently" Meets Objectives

The "B" or "good" teaching performance usually meets the objectives outlined in the Teaching Practice Program. This candidate would rate in the "frequently" category for the majority of the objectives for evaluation. On some objectives they may rate "always" or "occasionally."

C = Satisfactory or "Occasionally" Meets Objectives

The "C" or "satisfactory" teaching performance adequately meets the objectives outlined in the Teaching Practice Program. This candidate would rate in the "occasionally" category for the majority of the objectives for evaluation. On some objectives they may rate "frequently" or "rarely."

D = Unsatisfactory or "Rarely" Meets Objectives

The "D" or "unsatisfactory" teaching performance seldom meets the objectives outlined in the Teaching Practice Program. This candidate would rate in the "rarely" category for the majority of the objectives for evaluation. On some objectives they may rate "occasionally" or "never."

F = Failure or "Never" Meets Objectives

The "F" or "failure" teaching performance does not meet the objectives outlined in the Teaching Practice Program. This candidate would rate in the "never" category for the majority of the objectives for evaluation. On some objectives they may rate "occasionally" or "rarely."

The correlation of Teaching Practice grades to the classification of distinctions is:

A = First class honors

B = Second class (upper) honors

C = Second class (lower) honors

D = No distinction

F = No distinction

Teaching practice course weight would be consistent with other courses equaling 25%.

Final Evaluation Instrument

The objectives listed in the following instrument "Final Evaluation" are generated from the goals and objectives established for the Teaching Practice Program stated in the handbook, Teaching Practice: Guidelines for Student-Teachers. In addition, the more detailed categories of performance behaviors itemized in the form "Feedback on Teaching" were summarized for inclusion in the final evaluation. This instrument reflects a continuity of evaluation standards and objectives used to judge student teacher performance. This continuity provides for easier tracking of a candidate's performance and consistent evaluation. The same general areas of performance are included and a similar appraisal scale was used as in the midterm instrument "Feedback on Teaching."

The format of the final evaluation tool is a checklist and narrative suitable for both primary and secondary candidates. Section five, "Classroom Curriculum Areas" requires the evaluator to write a narrative elaborating on the extent of content knowledge. For the primary-level candidate, the content area strengths and weaknesses can be documented. For the secondary-level candidate, the evaluator can comment on the depth of content knowledge in subject area specialization, resources used, and presentation of the subject. Section six, "Additional Comments," provides for further elaboration to give a more comprehensive description of the candidate.

DEPARTMENT OF TEACHING PRACTICE

Final Evaluation - Teaching Practice I II (Circle one)

Candidate's Name_____FINAL GRADE: A B C D F (Circle one)

School_____Grade Taught_____

Evaluator: Supervisor Cooperating Teacher Principal (Circle one)

PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING: Always¦ Frequently¦ Occasionally¦ Rarely¦ Never¦ Not Observed

I. PREPARATION

The candidate is able to:

A. state learning objectives.

B. match objectives to the learning needs of pupils.

C. prepare appropriate teaching aids & equipment suitable for lesson.

D. select appropriate materials to meet needs of individuals and groups.

[insert grid lines]

II. TEACHING PERFORMANCE

The candidate is able to:

A. present lessons in a clear and organized manner.

B. properly pace lesson.

C. use a variety of teaching methods to stimulate interest and facilitate student learning.

D. indicate knowledge of subject matter.

E. demonstrate initiative & creativity.

F. demonstrate flexibility in teaching.

G. use assessment practices which provide timely and useful feedback to students.

H. construct valid and reliable measures of learning.

III. CLASSROOM INTERACTION

The candidate is able to:

A. demonstrate communication skills which facilitate learning.

B. use effective teaching aids.

C. use effective questioning techniques.

D. demonstrate favorable rapport with pupils

III. CLASSROOM INTERACTION (con't)

Always¦ Frequently¦ Occasionally¦ Rarely¦ Never¦ Not Observed

The candidate is able to:

E. encourage cooperation and participation among all pupils.

F. recognize how his/her behavior affects interaction with pupils.

G. address individual needs of pupils.

H. demonstrate appropriate methods of control and management (including safety).

I. provide physical environment which is responsive to individual difference and promotes individual learning.

[insert grid lines]

IV. PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCIES

The candidate is able to:

A. demonstrate and accept need for continuing development of skills and knowledge.

B. cooperate and assume responsibility as a member of school faculty.

C. accept suggestions for improvement of performance.

V. CLASSROOM CURRICULUM AREAS: For Primary candidates describe areas of content knowledge strength and areas needing improvement. For Secondary candidates comment on depth of content knowledge, resources, presentation, etc.

VI. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Provide further information to give a more comprehensive description of the candidate.

Printed Name of Evaluator

Official Position

Signature

Date

LV/92

Profiles of Performance

The following profiles are offered as additional assistance in evaluating the competency of the student teacher's performance. They are intended as a general guideline for the evaluator. A candidate may not display every characteristic described in a particular profile. Characteristics may overlap and these profiles are provided primarily for their heuristic value.

The basic assumption underlying these profiles is based on the view of teaching as profession and art. This view infers that teaching is a decision-making process.

These profiles can serve as a starting point from which the Teaching Practice Committee can debate the differing degrees of competency and how these competencies manifest in actual practice. It is hoped that a consensus can be reached for most of the traits described in each profile.

Profile of an "Outstanding" Performance

A = Outstanding or "Always" Meets Objectives

The "outstanding" student teacher demonstrates a unique ability to impart and inspire learning in his/her students. The candidate makes sound decisions and acts upon them wisely. In the face of problems and challenges this teacher will have no hesitancy to seek the information necessary to solve the problem. The "outstanding" teacher is aware of how his/her own behavior affects the behavior of his/her students. This candidate is considered "outstanding" because he/she displays enthusiasm, creativity, and resourcefulness in teaching and meeting the unexpected situations that occur in the classroom. The teacher demonstrates a variety of teaching strategies (for example, lecture, discussion, demonstration, individualized teaching, inquiry, independent projects). The student teacher willingly accepts suggestions for improvement of performance, for their performance is not necessarily "perfect." This teacher is always prepared and presents interesting and involving lessons demonstrating not only mastery of content but the ability to apply and impart content knowledge. Development of higher-order thinking skills (analysis, synthesis, evaluation) is a part of the curriculum. Student learning is assessed and relevant feedback is given. There is recognition and regard for the child's positive self-concept and self-esteem while maintaining good discipline with an orderly, positive classroom climate. Above all this teacher is flexible and adapts to the situation at hand. The objectives of the program consistently are met with a high-quality performance.

Profile of a "Good" Performance

B = Good or "Frequently" Meets Objectives

The "good" student teacher can motivate students to learn with interesting and involving lessons. This teacher frequently shows resourcefulness in lesson presentation, but may not have a high degree of creativity. Most of the time this candidate demonstrates an ability to make his/her own decisions and act upon them. The student teacher may not fully recognize how their own behavior may influence the behavior of their students. He/she accepts suggestions to improve their performance. This teacher will use more than one method of teaching. Command of content knowledge may be good but not encompassing and frequently presents the information in a relevant and clear style. This teacher develops lower-order thinking skills (knowledge, comprehension, application) and may provide activities to cultivate higher-order thinking skills as well. Student learning is frequently assessed and feedback is given. The student teacher realizes that building a student's positive self-concept may contribute to academic achievement and works toward maintaining a positive classroom climate. Discipline is good, but may be inconsistent. The student teacher may not always justify actions taken. Frequently this candidate demonstrates the ability to be flexible and adaptable to the situation. The objectives of the program usually are met with a good performance.

Profile of a "Satisfactory" Performance

C = Satisfactory or "Occasionally" Meets Objectives

The "acceptable" student teacher is usually prepared with adequate lessons, although they may not always be complete, clear, or orderly. At times this candidate shows resourcefulness. This teacher occasionally demonstrates an ability to make his/her own decisions and act upon them even though the results may not always be successful. The "acceptable" teacher may not fully recognize how their own behavior may influence the behavior of their students, but are accepting of suggestions to improve their performance. This teacher may use at least one consistent method of teaching which may be very effective (lecture, discussion, demonstration, etc.). The command of content knowledge is fair, and at times may be inaccurate. There is an effort to improve not only content knowledge but also performance skills as well. While not necessarily inspiring, the candidate makes an effort to engage student interest with mixed success. Students are engaged in mostly lower-level thinking (knowledge, comprehension, application), but may occasionally provide students the opportunity to develop higher-order thinking skills. This teacher

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

makes an effort to overcome difficulties that arise, for example, in classroom discipline. The candidate may maintain discipline in a rigid, authoritarian style and not have a grasp of how student positive self-esteem affects achievement. This may result in student behavior that is not always on-task. Sometimes the student teacher is flexible and adapts to the situation. On occasion the student teacher may demonstrate good performance. However, the objectives of the program usually are met with an adequate performance.

Profile of an "Unsatisfactory" Performance

D = Unsatisfactory or "Rarely" Meets Objectives

The "unsatisfactory" student teacher does make an effort to prepare and present lessons, but they are incomplete and are uninteresting, unclear, disorganized, or unsuitable for the academic level of students. Student learning is inadequately accessed and student feedback is rare and when done, may be inappropriate. This candidate does not show resourcefulness in using a variety of teaching aids or student materials. The student teacher may only use a "chalk and talk" teaching approach. Decisions may be avoided, poorly made, or unsuitable for students. There is a lack of awareness that his/her behavior affects the behavior of students. Discipline may be extremely authoritarian or very lax, both with poor results. Communication skills are poor and there is little positive rapport with students. Students are rarely on-task and are seldom engaged in active learning. The candidate may accept suggestions to improve performance, but may not follow through on suggestions. The command of content knowledge is poor and more study is required. Questions are at the lowest levels of the cognitive domain (knowledge and comprehension) and may be inadequately presented with little effort at encouraging an expanded response or discussion. Flexibility is not demonstrated. On occasion this candidate may exhibit fair performance. However, the objectives of the program usually are unmet and the performance does not indicate competence at even a minimum standard.

Profile of a "Failure" Performance

F = Failure or "Never" Meets Objectives

The student teacher deserving a "failure" makes no effort to prepare and present lessons that are complete and interesting to students. Lessons are usually disorganized, unsuitable, and inappropriate for the academic level of the students. Student learning is not accessed and students do not receive feedback on their progress. This candidate does not make an effort to develop teaching aids or appropriate student

materials. The student teacher may only use a "chalk and talk" teaching approach that rarely captures the attention and interest of the students. Decisions may be avoided and when made may be counterproductive to student learning. The student teacher has no concept of how his/her behavior affects the behavior of students. His/her unsatisfactory attitude may be demonstrated toward not only students but colleagues as well. Discipline is practiced in an inconsistent, inappropriate, disrespectful, or unfair manner. There is a negative classroom climate indicated by students who are fearful, anxious, and unproductive. Communication skills are very poor often resulting in confusion and lack of rapport with students and possibly colleagues. Students are not on-task and are passive; no effort is made to engage them in their assignments. The candidate does not accept suggestions to improve performance. Content knowledge is extremely poor and the student teacher may regularly present inaccurate information to students. Questions are poorly worded and presented and may not be relevant to the material being taught or the academic levels of the students. Questions and learning activities require only the lowest levels of thinking with no effort to encourage students to expand their responses. Rigidity in evidenced in teaching. The objectives of the program are not met and the performance clearly shows a lack of competence even at the minimum standard.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES

To effectively implement a letter-grade system, there are several issues to consider: the readiness of the current corps of university supervisors and the need for staff development; evaluation of supervisors; future recruitment of university supervisors and the characteristics of a supervisor; and a plan of action for initiating a letter-grade system for the evaluation of teaching practice.

Staff Development for University Supervisors

Regardless of the grading system used to evaluate student teaching performance, the quality of university supervision is an important issue. To implement a letter-grade system (which requires more finely delineated judgments) it is recommended that supervisors be prepared to use the new system. This preparation would require that supervisors participate in a staff development workshop. The consultant, Dr. Faith Trent, has also recommended staff development in clinical supervision for the Faculty of Education (June 1992).

Following are suggestions for the content of the workshop. This list is a general guideline and should be modified to match the specific needs of the supervisors. A needs assessment could be conducted to identify the particular concerns of university supervisors about using a letter-grade system specifically and clinical supervision generally. Topics for a staff development workshop include:

* the goals of Universiti Brunei Darussalam's Teaching Practice Program
* the characteristics of the effective supervisor
* styles of supervision
* the classroom observation
* pre- and post-observation conferencing
* the letter-grade system
* use of the final evaluation form

Evaluation of Supervisors

It is recommended that an evaluation be conducted of the performance of the university supervisor. This assessment would assist the Teaching Practice Department in maintaining a standard of performance. The constituency in the best position to provide feedback on the quality of supervisor support is the student teacher. Decisions would be required regarding the administration of the evaluation and the use of the results by the university. The following performance standards are presented for consideration of inclusion in an assessment instrument:

1. Knowledge of his/her role as a supervisor of student teachers

2. Provides meaningful immediate feedback that helps improve your teaching

3. Has communicated clear expectations for student teaching and evaluation

4. Is available by phone to handle special situations as they arise

5. Provides an atmosphere where students are encouraged to ask questions

6. Is knowledgeable of teaching strategies and methods

7. Encourages an atmosphere of openness and trust

9. Provides supervision in the classroom

10. Offers specific commendations on your teaching performance

11. Offers specific recommendations on your teaching performance

12. Provides student teacher with written feedback on the observation of teaching performance

13. In general, my rating of the university supervisor is

Rating Scale: very good, good, satisfactory, poor, very poor
(California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, School of Education, 1992)

Future Recruitment of Faculty

It has been brought to the attention of the Teaching Practice Committee that the duty of clinical supervision is not stated in the advertisement and job description of lecturer/professor in the Faculty of Education (Lane, 1992). This has caused concern that some members of the staff are not prepared or do not have the experience to supervise student teachers. Since it is the policy of the Faculty of Education that all teaching staff participate in supervision responsibilities, the following recommendations are offered for the future recruitment of the Faculty of Education:

1. The advertisement for future positions with the Faculty of Education state that clinical supervision will be a part of the duties,

2. A minimum qualification of three years of teaching experience at the primary or secondary level be required, and

3. Members of the Faculty of Education participate in interviewing prospective candidates, whenever feasible, to evaluate specific knowledge, skills, and experience.

Qualities of Effective Supervisors

For purposes of reference and dialogue, the following qualities and characteristics of effective supervisors are submitted. These can serve as guidelines for the recruitment of clinical supervisors and as points of discussion for a staff development workshop.

Based on the aims for teaching practice delineated by the Department of Teaching Practice, the following general characteristics and competencies of supervisors are presented for consideration. Some of the categories may overlap and an attempt has been made to consider both the direct (leading, asserting, criticizing) and indirect (guiding, supporting, listening) style of supervision (Acheson & Gall, 1987; Kroath, 1989). These characteristics and competencies are in addition to the expectation of knowledge in the theories of education and learning, knowledge in one's area of expertise, and knowledge of (or capability of learning) the Bruneian school system.

General Characteristics of an Effective Supervisor

The supervisor ought to have the:

* capability of being flexible, tolerant, & open minded.
* ability to listen.
* capability of coping with different ideological views of teaching.
* ability to handle students of mixed abilities in teaching competence.
* ability to express rationale arguments for opinions on teaching objectives.

Competencies of an Effective Supervisor

The supervisor ought to be able to:

* demonstrate different techniques and strategies of teaching concepts and skills for the normal (versus special education) classroom, for example, direct and indirect methods of teaching, grouping, and questioning techniques.
* apply reflectively various approaches to classroom discipline.
* discuss the pro's and con's of one's own teaching methods with regard to one's aims and values.
* assist student teachers to acquire basic teaching skills such as diagnosis, lesson planning, grading practices, test construction, classroom management, use of texts, and selection of appropriate teaching materials.
* respond to student teachers different levels of competencies through encouraging students to probe their own views and concepts of teaching.
* give constructive feedback and feedback for student teachers to develop a capacity for realistic self-assessment (Kroath, 1989).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Other Considerations

If and when the teaching practice course is incorporated into the semester, the Teaching Practice Committee should consider the issue of assigning unit equivalents for the supervision of student teachers. Currently a supervisor makes at least four visits per teaching practice session for each assigned student teacher. It is estimated that this includes at least 1.5 hours of contact time per student per visit. This does not include additional consulting time with a student teacher, meetings with cooperating teachers and principals, and travel time.

The minimum contact time per student in one teaching practice session is estimated at six hours (4 units x 1.5 hrs.). For the sake of comparison, this figure will be used when making a comparison to course contact hours. If a supervisor is assigned five student teachers, then contact hours are thirty (5 students x 6 hours each). At thirty contact hours, this is nearly equivalent to a two-unit course (2 hours per week x 14 weeks = 28 contact hours) even though it is over a shorter period. A scale of units could be created to include clinical supervision in the unit load of the university faculty member. The following scale is an example. The unit equivalents per student teacher are based on the number of contact hours required per course unit at Universiti Brunei Darussalam.

SCALE OF UNIT EQUIVALENTS FOR CLINICAL SUPERVISION

No. of Student Teachers	Contact Time*	Unit Equivalent**
One	6	.42
Two	12	.85
Three	18	1.28
Four	24	1.71
Five	30	2.14
Six	36	2.57
Seven	42	3.0

* @ 6 hrs. per session

** Based on Contact Time Per Course Unit:

1 unit = 14 hrs. (1 hr. per wk x 14 wks)

2 units = 28 hrs. (2 hrs. per wk x 14 wks)

3 units = 42 hrs. (3 hrs. per wk x 14 wks)

Plan of Action

The first decision of the Teaching Practice Committee is whether to change the current pass-fail grading system to a letter-grade system for the evaluation of student teacher performance. If the Teaching Practice Committee agrees to change the current teaching practice grading system, it is recommended that the committee take the following steps before the proposal is presented to Faculty Board. These steps include discussion and decision on:

1. the rationale for change,

2. the view of teaching that is the underlying assumption of the appraisal system,

3. the details of the evaluation system including the range of grades and the criteria for grading,

4. the contents and format of the final evaluation instrument,

5. the contents of the performance profiles,

6. the change of the course title of the current Teaching Practice I (Teaching Certificate Program) to reflect the actual course goals,

7. the use of a moderator from the faculty to act as a consultant to the assigned supervisor on the final evaluation of borderline cases,

8. who would complete the final evaluation form in addition to the university supervisor,

9. staff development for supervisors (including content)

10. the evaluation of the university supervisor, and

11. the revision of the Teaching Practice handbooks.

REFERENCES

Abu Bakar bin Hj. Md. Salleh. Interview. October 21, 1992.

Abdul Halim (Hj.) bin Hj. Yusof. Correspondence. November 14, 1992.

Asghar, Michael. Interview. November 16, 1992.

Acheson, Keith, A. and Gall, Meredith, Damien. Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers: Preservice and Inservice Applications. New York, London: Longman. 1987.

Aisah (Hjh.) bte Hj. Mohd. Yusof. Interviews & Meetings. July 29, August 5, September 8, October 13, 1992.

Alvarez, Anicia. Interviews. July 27, August 4, 1992.

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, School of Education. A Guide for Student Teachers and Cooperating Teacher. February, 1992.

Chin, Jacob. Interview. November 14, 1992.

Chong Choo Tuan, Nelson. Interview. September 29, 1992.

Department of Teaching Practice, Faculty of Education, Universiti Brunei Darussalam. Teaching Practice: Guidelines for Cooperating Teachers. Undated.

Department of Teaching Practice, Faculty of Education, Universiti Brunei Darussalam. Teaching Practice: Guidelines for UBD Supervisors. Undated.

Department of Teaching Practice, Faculty of Education, Universiti Brunei Darussalam. Teaching Practice: Guidelines for Student-Teachers. Undated.

Gitlin, Andrew and Smyth, John. Teacher Evaluation: Educative Alternatives. New York & London: The Falmer Press. 1989.

Goh Keat Seong. Interview. November 17, 1992.

House, Ernest R. and Lapan, Stephen, D. "Teacher Appraisal" in Rethinking Appraisal and Assessment. Stratford: Open University Press. 1989.

Isahak Bin Haron. "External Examiner's Report on Programs and Examination at the Faculty of Education, University (sic) Brunei Darussalam for Academic Year 1990-1991." June 8, 1991.

Jamudin (Hj.) bin Sahat. Interview. October 21, 1992.

Junaidah (Hjh.). Correspondence. November 16, 1992.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Kroath, Franz. "Evaluation of Competencies of Teaching Practice Supervisors within the Naturalistic Paradigm" in Rethinking Appraisal and Assessment. Stratford: Open University Press, 1989.

Lane, Terry. "Report of TP Supervisor to Teaching Practice Committee." July 4, 1992.

Liew, Elizabeth. "Teaching Practice: To Be Graded." Report from Head, Department of Language Education to Dean, Faculty of Education, May 28, 1992.

McIntyre, Donald. "Criterion-referenced Assessment of Teaching," in Rethinking Appraisal and Assessment. Stratford: Open University Press, 1989.

Ming, Cheah Swee. "Results of Faculty Vote on TP Grading." Report to the Faculty of Education, November 26, 1991.

Ming, Cheah Swee. "Debate on TP - To Grade or Not to Grade?" Undated.

Pearson, Allen, T. Teacher: Theory and Practice in Teacher Education. New York & London: Routledge, 1989.

Scriven, M. "New Functions of Evaluations." Evaluation Practice. Volume 7, 1, 1986.

Simons, Helen and Elliot, John. Rethinking Appraisal and Assessment. Stratford: Open University Press, 1989.

Sofiah (Hjh.) A. Serudin. Interview. December 1, 1992.

Suradinata, Muchkiar. Interview. November 18, 1992.

Tajudin (Hj.). Interview. November 30,1992.

Teaching Practice Committee, Universiti Brunei Darussalam Faculty of Education. Minutes of Meeting, August 24, 1992.

Trent, Faith. "Report to Universiti Brunei Darussalam on the Awards in the Faculty of Education," Visit 14-24 June, 1992.

Trent, Faith. "Teaching Practice in Restructured Awards," Memorandum, June 18, 1992.

Welsh, Jim. "Brief Report of the Review Committee for Pedagogical Studies," July 7, 1992.

Wise, A.E., Darling Hammond,L., McLaughlin, M.W. and Bernstein, H.T. Teacher Evaluation: A Study of Effective Practices. Santa Monica CA: Rand Corporation, 1984.